

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, continued to reject all examined claims. In response, Applicant submits the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1, 16, and 31 have been amended. Applicant submits that no new matter is added to the application by these amendments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendment and remarks set forth herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C 103(a)

Claims 1,3,4, 8, 11, 12, 14-19, 23, 26, 27, 29-34, 38, 41, 42, 44, 45 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Patent 7,237,266 to Aaron. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

In regard to independent claims 1, 16, and 31, Aaron does not teach or suggest the claimed combinations. As amended herein, each of the independent claims defines the following distinguishing features:

“providing selections corresponding to assessment items by a web-based interface, wherein **the respective assessment item comprises a manufacturing process for the semiconductor product**”;

“receiving a specific selection from the selections for the semiconductor product via a network”;

“displaying a plurality of data items corresponding to the selected assessment item, wherein the selected assessment item has a specific number of the data items, and the data items are parameters used to assess the selected assessment item”;

“receiving a selection of at least one specific data item among the data items via the network”;

“receiving input items corresponding to the data items **without the specific data item** via the network”;

“performing a reliability assessment for the semiconductor product toward the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection **according to the input items and the manufacturing process of the assessment item** corresponding to the selected specific selection”; and

“generating a result of the reliability assessment, wherein **the result comprises at least one output item for the specific data item** of the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection”.

Turning to each of the independent claims, in its entirety, claims 1, 16, and 31 recite:

1. A reliability assessment system for assessing a reliability of a semiconductor product, comprising:

- a web-based interface **providing selections corresponding to assessment items**, to receive a specific selection from the selections for the semiconductor product via a network, **display a plurality of data items corresponding to the selected assessment item, wherein the selected assessment item has a specific number of the data items, and the data items are parameters used to assess the selected assessment item**, receive a selection of at least one specific data item among the data items via the network, and receive input items corresponding to the data items **without the specific data item** via the network, wherein the respective assessment item comprises a manufacturing process for the semiconductor product; and
- an assessment engine to perform a reliability assessment for the semiconductor product toward the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection **according to the input items and the manufacturing process of the assessment item** corresponding to the selected specific selection, generate a result of the reliability assessment, and display the result on the interface, **wherein the result comprises at least one output item for the specific data item** of the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection.

16. A computerized reliability assessment method for assessing a reliability of a semiconductor product, comprising the steps of:
providing selections corresponding to assessment items by a web-based interface, wherein the respective assessment item comprises a manufacturing process for the semiconductor product;
receiving a specific selection from the selections for the semiconductor product via a network;
displaying a plurality of data items corresponding to the selected assessment item, wherein the selected assessment item has a specific number of the data items, and the data items are parameters used to assess the selected assessment item;
receiving a selection of at least one specific data item among the data items via the network;
receiving input items corresponding to the data items ***without the specific data item via the network;***
performing a reliability assessment for the semiconductor product toward the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection ***according to the input items and the manufacturing process of the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection;*** and
generating a result of the reliability assessment, ***wherein the result comprises at least one output item for the specific data item*** of the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection.

31. A machine-readable storage medium storing a computer program which, when executed, directs a computer to perform a method of reliability assessment for assessing a reliability of a semiconductor product, comprising the steps of:
providing selections corresponding to assessment items by a web-based interface, wherein the respective assessment item comprises a manufacturing process for the semiconductor product;
receiving a specific selection from the selections for the semiconductor product via a network;
displaying a plurality of data items corresponding to the selected assessment item, wherein the selected assessment item has a specific number of the data items, and the data items are parameters used to assess the selected assessment item;
receiving a selection of at least one specific data item among the data items via the network;

receiving input items corresponding to the data items ***without the specific data item via the network;***
performing a reliability assessment for the semiconductor product toward the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection ***according to the input items and the manufacturing process of the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection;*** and
generating a result of the reliability assessment, ***wherein the result comprises at least one output item for the specific data item*** of the assessment item corresponding to the selected specific selection.

(*Emphasis added*). Claims 1, 16, and 31 patently define over the cited art for at least the reasons that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

It is understood that, in the claimed embodiments, several assessment items (manufacturing processes) for a semiconductor product are provided, and one of the assessment items can be selected to be assessed. The Office Action asserts that “the items assessed are necessarily those chosen for assessment or else the wrong items would be assessed”. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and thinks the Office Action has set forth this assertion based on an improper hindsight reconstruction of the Applicant's own disclosure, since Aaron wholly fails to teach and disclose which items should be chosen.

In addition, in the claimed embodiment, each assessment item (manufacturing process) has a specific number of data items, the data items are parameters used to assess the corresponding assessment item. The Office Action asserts that “the user does not have to ask for “Line 62 of the code” to be assessed, but merely that the item is assessed”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In this regard, the data items are not codes of a specific line, as recited by the Office Action. In the claimed embodiments, the data items corresponding to the selected assessment item are displayed for users to

select. The selected specific data item is the target to be expected to obtain the output item, and users must provide input items for the unselected data items to the system for calculating the output item for the selected specific data item. Users can select an interest and unknown data item to be assessed, and provide input items for known data items for the assessment. For example, if a manufacturing process has 4 parameters (data items), such as A, B, C and D. In a situation, a user can select parameter A to be assessed, and provide input items for parameters B, C and D. After the assessment, the output item for parameter A is obtained. In another situation, a user can select parameter C to be assessed, and provide input items for parameters A, B and D. After the assessment, the output item for parameter C is obtained. Thus, the claimed feature (*emphasized above*) is not disclose anywhere in Aaron.

Further, in the previous Office Actions, Applicant argued that the reliability assessment for the selected assessment item is performed according to the input items of the unselected data items, and the manufacturing process of the selected assessment item. The Examiner, however, did not provide any response thereto. In the Aaron reference, the vulnerability information is retrieved by keyword matching between the policy information input by the user and the vulnerability information recorded in the database. It is clear that the assessment manners of the two applications are totally different, and nowhere does Aaron teach or disclose that the assessment is performed according to the input items of the unselected data items, and the manufacturing process of the selected assessment item.

Since Aaron fails to teach all features of the claimed embodiments, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 16, and 31 are patentable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1, claims 17-19, 23, 26, 27, 29, and 30 depend from claim 16, and claims 32, 33, 34, 38, 41, 42, 44 and 45 depend from claim 31, these claims patentably define over the cited art for the same reasons. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

By:

Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
600 Galleria Parkway
Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
(770) 933-9500